DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 304 JC 880 612

AUTHOR Harper, Jane; Lively, Madeleine
TITLE Languages for Communication Workshops, 1988: Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus. Final Project Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Tarrant County Junior Coll., Hurst, Tex. Northeast Campus.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; High Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; *Language Teachers; Oral Language; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary School Teachers; *Second Language Instruction; *Speech Communication; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Workshops; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In summer 1988, Tarrant County Junior College, Northeast Campus, conducted a series of eight 16-hour workshops and three 32-hour workshops for high school teachers of foreign languages. The workshops were intended primarily as in-service training to help foreign language teachers: (1) improve their oral proficiency in the language they teach; (2) increase their security and confidence in speaking that language; (3) develop skills in current foreign language instructional methodologies appropriate for novice and intermediate students; (4) develop an enhanced repertoire of instructional activities and materials to encourage students' oral participation in class; (5) gain cultural information; and (6) use the computer to generate instructional materials. Recruitment activities focused on foreign language instructors in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, foreign language consultants and program directors in other major cities in Texas, and foreign language departments in every secondary school in Texas with an enrollment of 150 or more. Registration priority was given to teachers in minority-populated schools, teachers who had never traveled to the country in which their language was spoken, and new and reassigned teachers. The project report describes the content and outcomes of the workshops, providing pre- and post-test data on the achievement of objectives. Program evaluation data are appended. (AAZC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301304

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

LANGUAGES FOR COMMUNICATION WORKSHOPS, 1988
TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

by:
Jane Harper
Madeleine Lively

1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Harper

M. Lively

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 880 G12

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

LANGUAGES FOR COMMUNICATION WORKSHOPS, 1988
TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE NORTHEAST CAMPUS

Based on our national need for individuals who can function effectively in a second language, not merely know how the language functions, the Texas essential elements in foreign language teaching and learning heavily emphasize the development of oral proficiency skills of students.

Psycholinguistic research and common sense both tell us that, if students are to become proficient in a new language, they must hear the language extensively before attempting to speak it, they must receive accurate and comprehensible input, and they must feel secure enough to risk trying to produce language. Unfortunately, many teachers are not proficient enough themselves to provide the quality of instruction needed. Many have never possessed good speaking skills; some have lost much of their oral facility while teaching beginners during several years without travel or study opportunities for themselves; others cannot provide a secure environment in the classroom because of their own insecurity in speaking the language.

With the increasing language enrollments in secondary schools, some teachers who have specialized in other disciplines but who took foreign language courses in college, perhaps many years ago, are being assigned classes in foreign languages. In addition, many teachers are lacking in techniques and materials for teaching and evaluating oral communication skills in students and for motivating students to speak. Teachers from all these categories need assistance in the area of language for oral communication.

WORKSHOP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In response to the needs of teachers for assistance in developing language and instructional skills, Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus designed a series of eight 16-hour workshops and three 32-hour workshops for teachers of foreign languages for the summer of 1988. These Language for Communication Workshops were intended primarily as in-service training for secondary school foreign language teachers and secondarily as retraining for secondary teachers who specialized in areas other than languages but who would be teaching languages during the following academic year.

Tarrant County Junior College worked with representatives from the foreign language curriculum administrative staff of the Fort Worth, Arlington, Birdville, and Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School Districts in the design of the workshop curriculum, staffing, and schedule for the 1988 offerings.

The Language for Communication Workshops had as the primary objectives that the participating teachers will:

1. Improve their own oral proficiency in the language that they teach;
2. Increase their security and confidence in speaking that language;
3. Develop skills in current foreign language instructional methodologies appropriate for novice and intermediate students, particularly in Total Physical Response and the Natural Approach;

4. Develop an enhanced repertoire of instructional activities and materials which encourage students' oral participation in class, and, therefore, the development of oral skills;
5. Gain cultural information about the people who speak that language;
6. Use the computer to generate instructional materials.

The development or improvement of teachers' oral skills and their increased facility at designing instructional materials were planned to enhance their effectiveness in the classroom. With increased listening opportunity and supportive materials which provide meaning to the spoken language, students should develop speaking skills more readily. Furthermore, more effective teaching materials will be beneficial in gaining and holding student attention, thus providing an improved teaching/learning environment.

Innovative techniques presented in the workshops included the Total Physical Response technique, the Natural Approach, the visual-based curriculum, computer-assisted instruction and materials design, Video Show computer hardware and software, and the Color Connection system of materials design.

GRANT INFORMATION

Tarrant County Junior College acquired funding through the Education for Economic Security Act, Title II, to support this project. Monies were allocated for methodology specialists; for tuition, materials, and travel stipends for participants, and for publicity and instructional stipends. Tarrant County Junior College received a total of $33,398 from EESA for these project costs.

COOPERATING LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

The two cooperating local education agencies for the project were Fort Worth Independent School District and Birdville Independent School District. Both districts supported the project financially, providing tuition and material stipends to their teachers. Fort Worth gave $2500 in stipends; Birdville paid $595 in tuition for their teachers. Annette Lowry, Program Director for Foreign Languages in the Fort Worth ISD, worked with the TCJC foreign language faculty in the design of the workshop curriculum and schedule and in publicizing the offerings among the Fort Worth teachers.

RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Once the project was funded by EESA, the directors implemented the publicity and recruitment campaign. The most effective recruitment activity was the distribution of invitation letters and application forms by mail. Personally-addressed letters were sent to all foreign language teachers in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex school districts and to all participants in prior TCJC workshops. Packets of materials were sent to the foreign language consultants and program directors in the major cities of Texas. Similarly, letters were sent to the department of foreign language in every secondary school in Texas with an enrollment of 150 or more students.

In an effort to reach and recruit minority teachers and teachers assigned to schools with high minority student populations, the directors requested from all Regional Service Centers in Texas a list of these teachers in their service areas. About fifty percent of these centers responded to this request. Personal letters encouraging workshop participation were sent to these teachers. In addition, Fort

Worth and Arlington ISD's provided TCJC with lists of their minority teachers and their minority-populated schools. Personal letters were also sent to these teachers.

Furthermore, the directors contacted the Fort Worth and Dallas Catholic Dioceses who in turn delivered packets of letters and applications to every school in their dioceses.

In addition to the direct-mail campaign, other recruitment efforts were made. Brochures, letters, and application forms were distributed at:

- the fall and spring conferences of the Texas Foreign Language Association,
- the spring conference of the Southwest Conference on Language Teaching,
- the spring meeting of the Long Star Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.

Announcements were placed in the bulletin of TFLA and AATSP. Inquiries and enrollments by interested teachers resulted from each publicity activity.

Since more applications were received than there were funded places available in the workshops, priority for registration was given to (1) teachers who had assignments in minority-populated schools, (2) teachers identified as belonging to historically-underrepresented groups, (3) teachers from Fort Worth, Arlington, Birdville, and Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School Districts, (4) teachers who had not studied or traveled in a country where their language of instruction is spoken natively, (5) teachers with less than five years experience, (6) teachers from other disciplines who had been assigned a

language class. All applicants from these categories received full funding from the grant. After these recipients had been named, the other applications were processed in order of date received.

Of the 453 total workshop enrollments, 334 were paid by funding agencies (EESA--275; Ft. Worth--42; Birdville--17). The remaining number, or 119 workshops, were paid for by 42 individual teachers who thought their attendance and participation in the workshops sufficiently important to pay the tuition with their own money.

EESA allocated a total of $3,932 to be disbursed to defray the participants' travel expenses. Of the 81 participants funded by EESA, 25 came from outside a 35 mile radius of the TCJC-NE Campus. Two eligible participants lived within the 35-75 mile range and received funds for a round trip to and from the campus for each day of the workshop. Twenty-three eligible participants lived outside the 75 mile range and thus received expenses for a round trip for each week they attended a workshop.

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE AND CURRICULUM

The workshops were established to support the theme of Languages for Oral Communication. They were designed both to develop oral communication skills and to teach contemporary instructional methodologies. The titles and topics were:

1. Total Physical Response
2. Color Connection
3. Natural Approach
4. Materials Development
5. Language Development in French
6. Language Development in German

7. Language Development in Spanish

8. Films in French

9. Conversation in French

10. Films in Spanish

11. Conversation in Spanish

The workshops were scheduled over a period of four weeks with sessions offered between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. They were scheduled so that participants could choose to attend all day, mornings only, afternoons only, from one to four weeks, taking from one workshop of 16 hours to seven workshops totalling 128 hours.

The following time-table was developed to utilize the flexible scheduling:

Week 1	8:00-11:50	Total Physical Response
	1:00- 4:50	Language Development
		French
		German
		Spanish
Week 2	8:00-11:50	Color Connection
	1:00- 4:50	Language Development, continued
Week 3	8:00-11:50	The Natural Approach
	1:00- 2:50	Films in French/Films in Spanish
	3:00- 4:50	Conversation in French/Spanish
Week 4	8:00-11:50	Materials Development
	1:00- 2:50	Films, continued
	3:00- 4:50	Conversation, continued

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

The 139 participants in the workshops represented a variety of grade levels and ethnic groups as indicated in the following tables:

TABLE I

TEACHING GRADE LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS

Teaching Grades K - 5	13
Teaching Grades 6 - 12	130

(Some teach at both levels)

TABLE II

RACE/ETHNICITY OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	3
Hispanic	20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1
American Indian	2
Anglo	113

TABLE III

RACE/ETHNICITY OF STUDENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

Black	1,279
Hispanic	2,158
Asian or Pacific Islander	468
American Indian	1
Anglo	11,041

TABLE IV

PUBLIC/PRIVATE SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Public Schools	120
Private Schools	19

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the workshops was based on two distinct procedures; (1) a comparison of pre- and post-assessment questionnaires on each of the workshops completed by each participant and (2) in-class observation of a sampling of teachers during the fall semester following the workshops.

Another planned evaluation component was pre- and post-testing of participants' oral proficiency by evaluators certified by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. However, between the time that the grant proposal was written and the workshops began, opinion among foreign language professionals concerning the possibility of significant change over such a short period of time caused the directors to eliminate this part of the evaluation. In response to the encouragement of the grant administrator at the Coordinating Board of Texas Colleges and Universities, the in-class observations were substituted for this part of the evaluation.

A number of factors must be considered in the evaluation of the project, the focus of which can be considered as three-fold:

1. the language proficiency development of the participants;
2. the acquisition of information about current foreign language methodologies; and
3. the development of materials for use in raising their own students' language proficiency.

Language Proficiency Development of the Participants

A major set of objectives centered around the development of the participant's own language proficiency. In order to provide proper oral language modeling and comprehensible input in the classroom,

teachers must themselves feel secure in their speaking ability. It is reasonable to assume that if a teacher perceives a personal gain in speaking ability, then an increased ability will follow, usually due to more practice and risk-taking. As the teacher's oral proficiency increases, the students receive improved modeling and comprehensible input, subsequently enhancing the environment necessary to produce higher oral skills in the students.

Language development workshops were offered in French, German, and Spanish. They consisted of 32 hours, four hours per day for eight days, of instruction in the target language with primary emphasis on the improvement of ability to sustain discourse in present, past, and future times.

The French and Spanish Films/Conversation workshops were also offered to meet these goals. Each day for eight afternoons, the groups viewed a film in the target language and participated in conversation activities that were coordinated with the films. The viewing of the films provided comprehensible input that increased listening abilities and enriched vocabulary. The subsequent conversation activities provided non-stressful opportunities for self-expression.

Since there were no oral proficiency pre- or post-workshop interviews conducted in order to measure the participants' gain in proficiency level, the evaluation instruments were based on the participants' perception of their own gains. Participants completed two separate assessment instruments before and after the language development workshops. The first of these was based on descriptors drawn from the speaking and understanding categories of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. Table V shows the participants perceived gains

in speaking and understanding in each language. Appendix A contains the evaluation documents with pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE V

PERCEIVED LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

SPEAKING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	3.42	4.11	+.69
German	3.45	3.94	+.49
Spanish	3.89	4.43	+.54

UNDERSTANDING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	3.48	4.18	+.70
German	3.93	4.22	+.29
Spanish	4.06	4.53	+.47

The second document was a Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating completed by the participants at the beginning and end of these workshops. This instrument measured the participants' confidence in speaking as well as their perceived strengths and weaknesses in specific areas of language use. Table VI shows the gains made by participants in each language. Appendix B contains the evaluation documents with pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE VI

CONFIDENCE IN SPEAKING

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	3.08	3.51	+.43
German	3.08	3.63	+.55
Spanish	3.43	3.88	+.45

PERCEIVED LANGUAGE ABILITY IN SPECIFIC AREAS

Language	Pre	Post	Difference
French	2.81	3.12	+.31
German	2.93	3.48	+.55
Spanish	3.00	3.62	+.62

Observations

1. Spanish teachers rated themselves higher at the outset, possibly reflecting
   a. more opportunity to practice Spanish in Texas
   b. the presence of some native speakers in the group.
2. The French teachers perceived the greatest gains in speaking and understanding, possibly because their initial rating was the lowest and progress advances faster at the lower levels.
3. Although the German teachers showed the greatest gain in confidence in speaking, they reported the least gains in perceived speaking and understanding. A possible factor is the time spent on reading authentic German materials in this workshop.

Conclusions

1. Participants in all three languages showed increases in perceived abilities in speaking and understanding.

2. Participants in all three languages showed increased confidence in speaking.
3. Participants in all three languages showed growth in perceived language ability in specific areas.

Acquisition of Information about Current Methodologies

A second major set of objectives of the project centered around the acquisition of information about current foreign language methodologies appropriate for communication-based classrooms. The three workshops provided to meet these objectives were Total Physical Response, taught by Carol Stacy, Natural Approach, taught by Dr. Robert DiDonato, and the Color Connection, taught in two groups: first-timers by Pam Kaatz and advanced by Carol Stacy.

All three workshops asked their participants to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 their familiarity with knowledge of concepts relevant to each respective methodology. Table VII shows the gains in information made by the participants in each workshop. Appendix C contains the evaluation documents with the pre- and post-workshop scores on each item.

TABLE VII

Workshop	Pre	Post	Difference
Total Physical Response	2.38	4.58	+2.20
Natural Approach	2.85	4.35	+1.50
Color Connection	3.84	4.66	+ .92

An additional scale was used in the Total Physical Response and the Color Connections workshops to determine gains in ability to utilize the methodological concepts treated. This second scale was developed by the consultants and directors who have worked in the TCJC

projects for four consecutive years. It had become apparent that although many language teachers may have been exposed to some current foreign language methodologies, many have not yet had enough training in order to be able to utilize those methods in their own classrooms. Table VIII shows those gains.

TABLE VIII

Workshop	Pre	Post	Difference
Total Physical Response	2.40	4.16	+1.76
Color Connection	3.18	4.33	+1.15

Observations

1. The greatest gains, both in information acquired and in degree of utilization, were made in the Total Physical Response workshop, possibly because the methodology has been in vogue longer and training sessions in it are less frequently offered for in-service by districts and at professional conferences. Participants' initial ratings in TPR were the lowest of all three workshops but ultimately showed the greatest gain.

2. The pre-assessment scores for the Color Connection workshop were dramatically higher, possibly due to the fact that the workshop is so popular that it draws "repeat participants" who come into the workshop with more previous knowledge. The workshop was divided into two groups, "first-timers" and "advanced." Their assessment ratings were combined, but had they been separated, more gain might have been noted by the beginner group.

3. The amount of gain was lower for the Color Connection workshop, possibly because the initial ratings started at a significantly higher point and progess advances more slowly at higher levels.

4. Despite the lower degree of gain, the final ratings for the Color Connection workshop were the highest on both scales, possibly indicating that participants perceived themselves to be adept both in their knowledge of the methodology and in their ability to utilize it.

5. The gains perceived by the participants were significantly greater in methodology workshops than in language development workshops, possibly because (a) language learning takes many hours of exposure and practice to register gain, (b) progress advances more slowly at a higher level, and foreign language teachers have been studying their language longer than their methodologies, and (c) current methodologies in foreign language teaching were relatively new to the participants and therefore the room for gain was greater.

6. An item analysis of the documents in Appendix C show specific areas in which the greatest gain was evidenced, possibly indicating to workshop directors where the need for future training and development may lie. Those areas are:

a. global versus linear learning

b. language learning versus acquisition

c. comprehension before production

d. delayed oral response

e. higher order thinking skills

f. strategies for extended discourse

g. partner- and group-work activities

NOTE: Items e. and f. are the topics for two of the workshops already scheduled in the 1989 series at TCJC and funded by EESA.

Conclusions

1. In all three workshops teaching methodology gains in perceived acquisition of information were evidenced by participants.
2. In both workshops polled for gain in ability to utilize the methodologies in the classroom, participants evidenced a perceived gain.

Development of Materials to Increase Communication in the Classroom

A third major set of objectives centered around the development of activities and materials to increase the comprehensible input necessary for developing communication skills. Teachers often express frustration with inservice workshops that present theory and methodology but that leave them without the fundamental physical tools necessary to implement the newly-gained techniques in the classroom.

The two workshops dealing with materials development were **Color Connection** and **Materials Development**. The **Color Connection** workshop consisted of the explanation and demonstration of learning theories and the visuals and props to implement those theories while the **Materials Development** workshop allowed the participants time to actually develop their own personal set of supplies.

In the **Materials Development** workshop dramatic results were noted in the participants reporting of their increased supply of materials, both in terms of subject content addressed and in medium. (See Appendix D for item analysis.)

TABLE IX

PARTICIPANTS REPORTING AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Vocabulary	100%
Subject-Verb Agreement	92.30%
Noun-Adjective Agreement	80.77%
Verb Conjugations	96.43%
Pronoun Cases	85.71%
Culture	86.20%
Geography	79.31%
Conversation	96.67%

Participants noted their increase in pedagogical materials by medium on a scale of 1 to 5, "not at all" to "significantly."

TABLE X

INCREASE IN SUPPLY OF PEDOGOGICAL MATERIALS BY MEDIUM

Slides	1.87
Visual Aids	4.77
Computer-Generated Art	4.07
Audio Tapes	2.93
Teaching Games	3.77
Posters and Signs	4.60

Observations

1. It is worth noting that most participants show that they developed materials to enhance their teaching of culture, geography, and conversation as well as the more traditional grammatical concepts.
2. Most teachers appear to have produced a broad range of materials, both in terms of subject content and media.

3. The low score in the slides category can be attributed to the short time span of the workshop.

Conclusion

Teachers left the workshops with noticeably increased supplies to take back to their classrooms. In addition, the instructors reported an atmosphere of enthusiastic production and sharing on the part of the participants.

Post-Workshop Classroom Visits

The evaluation process also included classroom observations of a sampling of the participants. Twenty-eight French, German, or Spanish secondary teachers were visited and observed while teaching a typical class in their own school setting. These teachers were selected on the bases of their accessibility to the evaluating personnel (in the Dallas-Ft. Worth metropolitan area), their willingness to receive an evaluator, their having attended a representative number of workshops in the project, and their role in achieving a balance in representation of priority groups targeted by the project. The observation instrument used was prepared by the Coordinating Board for the EESA projects. (Appendix E contains some sample observation instruments.)

The selected evaluators were Dr. Maurice Elton, French, Southern Methodist University in Dallas; Dr. Mary Williams, French, Tarrant County Junior College Northeast Campus in Hurst; Dr. Lana Rings, German, University of Texas at Arlington; Carol Ross Stacy, Spanish, Newman-Smith High School in Carrollton; and Pamela Kaatz, Spanish, Haltom High School in Haltom City. Dr. Elton has served in the 1987 and 1988 projects as an evaluator of the oral proficiency of teacher participants in language development workshops. He is an ACTFL-trained

and certified oral proficiency tester. All the other evaluators have actively participated as consultants and/or instructors in the TCJC workshops.

The teachers visited were observed in consideration of the type(s) of workshops (language development, methodology, materials development) they attended. Their comments in the post-visit interview were also noted in order to get a summative report of the most helpful aspects of their summer experience that are manifesting themselves now in the classroom three months into the school year.

Observations

1. Teachers in the language development workshops report and show evidence of added self-confidence and subsequently more extensive use of the target language in the classroom.

2. Methodology participants show greater variety of classroom activities and their students show more motivation and involvement. Some do, however, still show a certain reliance on former more traditional methods while incorporating selected new activities as time for preparation permits.

3. Materials development participants are immediately identified by the physical decor of their classrooms, having created a "cultural island" for their students. The use of manipulatives and props for contextualization was observed as widespread and was enthusiastically received by students. Evaluators noted that classes using support materials stayed more consistently in the target language.

4. All teachers visited report a renewed sense of self-confidence, preparedness, and job satisfaction as a direct result of their participation in the summer workshops.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPANTS' LEVEL OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Language Development Workshop - French

Language Development Workshop - German

Language Development Workshop - Spanish

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP - FRENCH

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.41	4.86	+.45
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.27	4.64	+.37
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.05	4.73	+.68
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	3.86	4.59	+.73
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	3.91	4.59	+.68
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	3.77	4.64	+.87
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	3.36	4.09	+.73
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.05	4.09	+1.04
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.59	3.27	+.68
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.41	3.09	+.68

11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.95	2.64	+.69
Totals	3.42	4.11	+.69
UNDERSTANDING:	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.50	4.91	+.41
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.27	4.77	+.50
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	3.86	4.68	+.82
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	3.63	4.36	+.73
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	3.23	4.09	+.89
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.23	4.05	+.82
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.00	3.82	+.82
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	2.09	2.73	+.64
Totals	3.48	4.18	+.70

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP - GERMAN

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.57	4.86	+.29
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.43	4.86	+.43
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.43	4.57	+.14
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	4.00	4.29	+.29
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	3.71	4.29	+.58
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	4.00	4.29	+.29
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	3.57	3.86	+.29
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	2.86	3.71	+.85
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.43	3.14	+.71
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.14	3.00	+.86

11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	1.86	2.43	+.57
Totals	3.45	3.94	+.49
UNDERSTANDING:	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.57	4.86	+.29
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.71	5.00	+.29
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	4.29	4.86	+.57
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	4.14	4.29	+.15
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	3.71	4.00	+.29
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	3.57	3.86	+.29
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.71	3.86	+.15
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	2.71	3.00	+.29
Totals	3.93	4.22	+.29

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP - SPANISH

Indicate the degree to which you can display the following skills in the target language:

SPEAKING:	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Can speak isolated words and a few high-frequency phrases.	4.69	4.85	+.16
2. Can speak basic courtesies.	4.69	4.85	+.16
3. Can ask and answer simple questions dealing with basic objects, places and family.	4.77	4.85	+.0
4. Can initiate, minimally sustain, and close basic communicative tasks; can ask and answer questions.	4.23	4.77	+.54
5. Can introduce self, order a meal, ask directions, and make purchases.	4.46	4.85	+.39
6. Can talk simply about self, family members, personal history and leisure activities.	4.38	4.38	.00
7. Can maintain connected discourse for simple narrative and/or description.	4.15	4.46	+.31
8. Can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.	3.54	4.38	+.84
9. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence, support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize.	2.85	3.85	+1.00
10. Can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics.	2.62	4.00	+1.38

11. Can support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.	2.38	3.54	+1.16
Totals	3.89	4.43	+.54
UNDERSTANDING:	Pre	Post	Difference
12. Can understand occasional isolated words such as cognates and borrowed words.	4.75	4.77	+.02
13. Can understand words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae.	4.67	4.77	+.10
14. Can understand main ideas and/or some facts dealing with basic personal and social needs.	4.58	4.77	+.19
15. Can understand sentence-length speech on lodging, transportation and shopping.	4.17	4.77	+.60
16. Can understand short routine telephone conversations, simple announcements and reports over the media.	4.08	4.54	+.46
17. Can understand main ideas of description and narrative in different time frames (present, past, habitual, or imperfect).	4.00	4.38	+.38
18. Can understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect.	3.67	4.38	+.71
19. Can understand technical discussions in a academic/professional settings, in lectures speeches and reports.	2.58	3.85	+1.27
Totals	4.06	4.53	+.47

APPENDIX B

DEVELOPMENT OF PERCEIVED LANGUAGE ABILITY IN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating - French

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating - German

Communication Skills Oral Self-Rating - Spanish

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING — FRENCH

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in French?

	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0			
Novice Mid	3	0	Advanced	3	5
Novice High	2	4	Advanced Plus	1	1
Intermediate Low	8	2	Superior	1	1
Intermediate Mid	7	6			
Intermediate High	7	12			

2. How confident of your abilities in French do you feel in each of these situations?

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. In your classes	4.06	4.22	+.16
b. With students outside of class	3.94	4.25	+.31
c. With colleagues	3.03	3.72	+.69
d. With other teachers from other schools	2.97	3.50	+.53
e. In formal situations with predetermined topics	2.91	3.38	+.47
f. In social situations with native speakers	2.34	2.88	+.54
g. With native speakers in their country	2.31	2.65	+.34
Totals	3.08	3.51	+.43

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. Grammar	3.34	3.59	+.25
b. Classroom vocabulary	3.84	4.25	+.41
c. Casual conversation	3.50	3.94	+.44
d. Current events/political vocabulary	2.16	2.41	+.25
e. Literary vocabulary	2.31	2.53	+.22
f. Slang	1.75	2.00	+.25
Totals	2.81	3.12	+.31

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING — GERMAN

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in German?

	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0			
Novice Mid	1	0	Advanced	0	0
Novice High	1	1	Advanced Plus	2	1
Intermediate Low	0	2	Superior	0	0
Intermediate Mid	3	1			
Intermediate High	0	1			

2. How confident of your abilities in German do you feel in each of these situations?

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. In your classes	4.00	4.14	+.14
b. With students outside of class	3.86	4.00	+.14
c. With colleagues	3.57	4.00	+.43
d. With other teachers from other schools	3.14	3.71	+.57
e. In formal situations with predetermined topics	2.57	3.43	+.86
f. In social situations with native speakers	2.14	3.29	+.15
g. With native speakers in their country	2.29	2.86	+.57
Totals	3.08	3.63	+.55

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. Grammar	4.14	4.29	+.15
b. Classroom vocabulary	4.29	4.43	+.14
c. Casual conversation	3.29	4.00	+.71
d. Current events/political vocabulary	2.00	2.71	+.71
e. Literary vocabulary	2.14	2.86	+.72
f. Slang	1.71	2.57	+.86
Totals	2.93	3.48	+.55

COMMUNICATION SKILLS ORAL SELF-RATING — SPANISH

1. How would you describe your current oral abilities in Spanish?

	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Novice Low	0	0			
Novice Mid	1	0	Advanced	2	2
Novice High	0	1	Advanced Plus	4	2
Intermediate Low	5	1	Superior	0	2
Intermediate Mid	2	3			
Intermediate High	1	4			

2. How confident of your abilities in Spanish do you feel in each of these situations?

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. In your classes	4.27	4.20	-.07
b. With students outside of class	4.00	4.33	+.33
c. With colleagues	3.40	3.87	+.47
d. With other teachers from other schools	3.33	4.00	+.67
e. In formal situations with predetermined topics	3.27	3.73	+.46
f. In social situations with native speakers	2.87	3.53	+.66
g. With native speakers in their country	2.87	3.47	+.60
Totals	3.43	3.88	+.45

3. Indicate your strengths and weaknesses in each area.

	Pre	Post	Difference
a. Grammar	3.60	3.87	+.27
b. Classroom vocabulary	4.07	4.67	+.60
c. Casual conversation	3.53	4.33	+.80
d. Current events/political vocabulary	2.33	3.07	+.74
e. Literary vocabulary	2.40	3.07	+.67
f. Slang	2.07	2.73	+.66
Totals	3.00	3.62	+.62

APPENDIX C

ACQUISITION OF INFORMATION ABOUT

CURRENT METHODOLGOIES

Total Physical Response

Natural Approach

Color Connection, Scale A

Color Connection, Scale B

TOTAL PHYSICAL RESPONSE

	Pre	Post	Difference
A. I have knowledge of the following concepts:			
1. The meaning of TPR	2.71	4.80	+2.09
2. What is usually taught with TPR	2.41	4.41	+2.00
3. Comprehension before production	2.36	4.69	+2.33
4. Delayed oral response	2.52	4.71	+2.19
5. Communication vs. repetition	2.62	4.67	+2.05
6. Global vs. linear learning	1.76	4.27	+2.51
7. Re-cycling vocab. in novel variations	2.34	4.39	+2.05
8. Language learning vs. acquisition	2.32	4.67	+2.35
Totals	2.38	4.58	+2.20
B. I can use these TPR techniques:			
1. Combination (serial) commands	2.96	4.45	+1.49
2. Optimal sequence of TPR activities	2.08	4.08	+2.00
3. Role of the native language	2.35	4.12	+1.77
4. Varying TPR practice	2.14	4.22	+2.08
5. Other activities for showing comprehension	2.51	4.27	+1.76
6. How to create TPR lesson plans	2.35	3.82	+1.47
Totals	2.40	4.16	+1.76
C. I can extend TPR in the following ways:			
1. Into speaking	2.63	4.70	+2.07
2. Into reading and writing	2.10	4.02	+1.92
3. Into verb manipulation (person and tense)	2.18	4.37	+2.19
4. Into higher thinking skills	2.02	4.24	+2.22
Totals	**2.23**	**4.33**	**+2.10**

THE NATURAL APPROACH

Indicate the degree of your knowledge of or familiarity with the following areas:

A: General	Pre	Post	Difference
1. The characteristics and levels of proficiency.	3.30	4.42	+1.12
2. Proficiency and its applications to the classroom.	3.09	4.48	+1.39
3. Teaching toward functional language use.	3.56	4.61	+1.05
4. Developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills.	3.41	4.46	+1.05
5. Use of authentic materials.	3.04	4.46	+1.42
6. Communicative testing procedures (oral/written).	2.65	3.96	+1.31
7. Sequencing communicative activities.	2.60	4.27	+1.67
8. The role of grammar.	3.27	4.54	+1.47
B: Specific	**Pre**	**Post**	**Difference**
1. Techniques to teach reading and listening	2.76	4.44	+1.68
2. Partner- and group-work activities.	2.56	4.58	+2.02
3. Incorporating authentic materials as a basis for skill-development activities.	2.87	4.60	+1.83
4. Creating integrated tests.	2.50	3.71	+1.21
5. Writing: A Process Approach.	2.26	4.17	+1.91
6. Strategies for extended discourse.	2.09	4.21	+2.12
Totals	2.85	4.35	+1.50

COLOR CONNECTION - BUILDING AN ARTIFICIAL REALITY

Scale A: Degree of Awareness

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Increasing a student's involvement (both physically and mentally) in the learning situation increases his comprehension and retention.	4.61	4.35	-0.26
2. An Artificial Reality can be created that makes language production the logical outcome of the situation.	3.69	4.83	+1.14
3. Manipultives (supplies for hands-on activities) can teach both vocabulary and grammar.	4.17	4.88	+0.71
4. Associating a word with an object or person facilitates comprehension and retention (Paired Associative Learning).	4.28	4.35	+0.07
5. Creating a "Group Memory," makes language real.	2.85	4.75	+1.90
6. Vocabulary words can be presented in a visual way, so that their meanings are obvious, allowing instant comprehension and communication.	3.69	4.88	+1.19
7. Mental maps for grammar concepts can be artificially created by using color, symbols, physical forms, and locations.	3.31	4.75	+1.44
8. Physical reactions or symbols can replace technical grammatical terminology.	3.02	4.50	+1.48

9. A logically connected series of utterances is easier to learn than disconnected phrases (Gouin series).	3.63	4.58	+0.95
10. Relating new grammatical and lexical items to prior knowledge facilitates learning.	4.11	4.69	+0.58
Totals	3.74	4.66	+0.92

COLOR CONNECTION - BUILDING AN ARTIFICIAL REALITY

Scale B: Degree of Ability to Utilize

	Pre	Post	Difference
1. Increasing a student's involvement (both physically and mentally) in the learning situation increases his comprehension and retention.	3.69	4.55	+0.86
2. An Artificial Reality can be created that makes language production the logical outcome of the situation.	3.13	4.60	+1.47
3. Manipultives (supplies for hands-on activities) can teach both vocabulary and grammar.	3.37	3.55	+0.18
4. Associating a word with an object or person facilitates comprehension and retention (Paired Associative Learning).	3.56	4.53	+0.97
5. Creating a "Group Memory," makes language real.	2.57	4.42	+1.85
6. Vocabulary words can be presented in a visual way, so that their meanings are obvious, allowing instant comprehension and communication.	3.58	4.55	+0.97
7. Mental maps for grammar concepts can be artificially created by using color, symbols, physical forms, and locations.	2.67	4.21	+1.54
8. Physical reactions or symbols can replace technical grammatical terminology.	2.37	4.18	+1.81

9. A logically connected series of utterances is easier to learn than disconnected phrases (Gouin series).	3.20	4.21	+1.01
10. Relating new grammatical and lexical items to prior knowledge facilitates learning.	3.63	4.49	+0.86
Totals	3.18	4.33	+1.15

APPENDIX D

ACQUISITION OF MATERIALS

Materials Development

Materials Development Workshop

1. I now have at my disposal these **additional** pedagogical materials for use in my classroom that will aid in teaching in the following areas:

	yes	% yes	no
a. vocabulary	29	100.00	0
b. subject-verb agreement	24	92.30	2
c. noun-adjective agreement	21	80.77	5
d. verb conjugation	27	96.43	1
e. pronoun cases	24	85.71	4
f. culture	25	86.20	4
g. geography	23	79.31	6
h. conversation	29	96.67	1

3. I feel that I have increased my supply of the following pedagogical materials :

	% of Increase
a. slides	1.87
b. visual aids	4.77
c. computer-generated art	4.07
d. audio tapes (excluding text-accompanied)	2.93
e. teaching games	3.77
f. posters and signs	4.60

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JAN 27 1989